

09/745,594

Remarks

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 15 are amended. Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are now pending in the application.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,658,463 to Dillon et al. (hereafter, "Dillon et al.") in view of U.S. Patent 6,173,322 to Hu (hereinafter "Hu"). However, in the body of the rejection, the Examiner also cites "Hopmann", which Applicants assume to be U.S. Patent No. 6,694,335 to Hopmann et al. (hereinafter "Hopmann et al."). This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 1-5, 7-10 and 12-20 are believed allowable based on the above amendments and following discussion.

Applicants' cache device may store information from the user (portable device) until such time as the remote device becomes available. The remote device has access to a database which is typically too large to store on the portable device. For instance, a user may update large amounts of information to be synchronized with a database via the remote device, but the remote device may not always be available. Further, the user may desire to uncouple the portable wireless communication appliance from the cache device, i.e., take the portable device to another location, and enable the remote database to be updated as soon as the remote device becomes available.

In general, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach the claimed elements of Applicants' invention. None of the references teach managing a database where a predetermined portion of the database is stored on the cache-device where the cache-device is accessible to a portable device, where the portable device may cause an update to a remote database via a remote device while connected to the cache-device or that the update is delayed until the remote device becomes available. In the latter case, the portable device may no longer be connected the cache-device.

The Examiner misapplies the teachings of Dillon et al., as Dillon et al. teach a method for caching web pages for faster access to a user. Dillon et al. do not teach updating or managing a database based on information received from a user (via the portable device).

09/745,594

Specifically, Hopmann et al. teach a device for synchronizing changes among multiple copies of data. Hopmann et al. teach that an identifier represents the current state of the data and the identifier is used to determine what, if any, changes have occurred to the data. Thus, instead of comparing the data itself to see if changes have been made, the identifier is used to simply and easily determine if changes were made to the data.

Dillon et al. teach a communication system including an upstream proxy server and two reporting downstream proxy servers, where the upstream proxy server is capable of multicasting a uniform resource locator (URL) to the reporting downstream proxy servers, the reporting downstream proxy servers interact with the upstream proxy server to resolve cache misses and the upstream proxy servers returns a resolution to a cache miss via multicast. In essence, Dillon et al. teach a web server system which uses upstream and downstream proxies to "cache" popular web pages. By storing the popular web pages and monitoring "cache misses," i.e., when the popular page is requested but not locally stored, the web casting service may provide faster service to the requester.

Further, as cited, Dillon et al. (Col. 7, lines 44-66) teach a multi-casting system to provide information to a web user. Dillon et al. do not teach or suggest a system where information is cached at a remote portable device and sent to a remote computer via a cache device. Dillon et al. is limited to coordinating uplink and downlink proxy servers and saving information at a proxy server to then pass the information to a PC. Dillon et al. do not teach receiving information updates from the portable device or providing portions of information to the portable device.

The cited references are directed toward providing cached copies of web pages for faster access (Dillon et al.), synchronizing changes to multiple copies of data (Hopmann et al.), and distribution of client requests received from a digital computer network to provide an intermediary between the client and one or more content servers that actually service the client request (Hu). None of the references teach that the cache device stores a copy of a predetermined portion of a database. None of the references, either alone or in combination, teach accessing or managing the database where a predetermined portion of the database information may be stored in a cache device accessible to a portable device and only occasionally updating the database by the remote device, where the portable device may access information in the database when the

09/745,594

cache device has access to the remote device, and to a portion of the database when the remote device is unavailable.

Hopmann et al. teach the synchronization of data on a network. Hopmann et al. do not teach the management of a database, although the synchronization method is asserted to be suitable for use with a database (Col. 5, lines 3-5). If the teachings of Hopmann et al. were applied to databases, it is not taught or suggested that only a predetermined portion of the database is to be stored in a cache. Similarly, Hu does not teach storing a copy of a predetermined portion of the database. Hu teaches caching heavily accessed data, according to traditional cache techniques. (Col. 5, line 59) Traditional techniques do not cache predetermined portions of databases, but merely data that is frequently accessed. Finally, Dillon et al. teach a satellite uplink and downlink system for caching web pages for easier/faster retrieval. The databases suggested by Dillon et al. merely contain the status (and optionally the content) of URLs of interest in the upstream proxy server or contain a domain name cache containing entries for the domain names or IP addresses of web-servers. In other words, the only databases taught by Dillon et al. are used to manage the proxy servers and provide URLs to a user. Dillon et al. do not teach managing a database accessible to the remote device, where a predetermined portion of the database is stored on the caches device accessible to the portable device.

Applying the teachings of Hu to Hopmann et al. and Dillon et al. would result in a system that synchronized data on a network where frequently accessed data from content servers or web servers may be accessed via a data cache. A combination of these references would not result in a portable wireless device used to access a database in a connected mode or unconnected mode based on the accessibility of the remote device. Moreover, combination of these references is improper as they solve different and unrelated problems. Thus, there is no motivation to add a cache to the synchronization of data on a network, nor is there motivation to utilize uplink and downlink proxy servers to provide access to cached URLs. Thus, independent Claims 1, 5, 10 and 15, and their progeny are believed allowable.

Further, as per Claims 7 and 12, Hopmann et al. does not teach setting cache-device preferences, as asserted by the Examiner. The cited reference (Col. 11, lines 15-30, 34-52 and Col. 12, lines 35-45) do not teach or suggest cache-device preferences, but discusses

09/745,594

synchronization of data and using local copies of data while disconnected. The Examiner admits that Hopmann et al. does not teach or suggest using a cache. Thus, no cache-device preferences are taught or suggested. Moreover, specifically as recited in Claim 7, cache-device preferences are explicitly defined as user preferences and configuration settings. This type of preference is neither taught nor suggested by the cited references.

As for Claims 9 and 14, the Examiner asserts that Hopmann et al. disclose *synchronizing the copy of the portion of the database with the database according to the cache-device preferences prior to the unavailability of the remote device*. This assertion is not possible as Hopmann et al. neither teach nor suggest cache-device preferences, or that a predetermined portion of the database is stored in the cache device. Thus, all claims remaining in the application are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 29 July 2005

/s/ Joni D. Stutman-Horn

Joni D. Stutman-Horn
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,173
(703) 633-6845

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030